

#### REMARKS

The Examiner and the undersigned attorney conducted a telephone interview on November 3, 2006. Among the issues discussed was the fact that claim 30 included allowable subject matter vis-à-vis the prior art, but stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Also discussed were possible amendments that could be employed to modify the term “functional group” and thereby define over “aromatic” groups. The Examiner indicated that any amendments not set forth in the pending claims would necessitate additional searching, and therefore would not be considered inasmuch as the application is under final rejection.

In view of the telephone interview, Applicants have amended claim 6 to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and to incorporate subject matter specified in claim 30. Claim 30 has been cancelled, thereby rendering the rejection of claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 moot.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments presented herein, the Applicants believe that they have properly set forth the invention and accordingly, respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejections provided in the last Office Action. A formal Notice of Allowance of claims 6-11, 20-28, and 31-37 is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner care to discuss any of the foregoing in greater detail, the undersigned attorney would welcome a telephone call.

No new claims have been added and therefore no additional fees are believed due at this time. Nonetheless, in the event that a fee required for the filing of this document is missing or insufficient, the undersigned attorney hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge payment of any fees associated with this communication or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-0925.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Arthur M. Reginelli, Reg. No. 40,139  
Renner, Kenner, Greive, Bobak, Taylor & Weber  
Fourth Floor, First National Tower  
Akron, Ohio 44308-1456  
Telephone: (330) 376-1242

Attorney for Applicants

December 10, 2006